



U. S. ARMY ORDNANCE CENTER AND SCHOOL
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE
COMMANDING GENERAL

3 MAY 1963

25X1A
[REDACTED]
Office of the Comptroller
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington 25, D. C.

25X1A
[REDACTED]
In response to a number of questions regarding the experimental officer efficiency report system, I have prepared the attached inclosure. I am sending it to all members of the class, since there seemed to be a genuine interest in the concept. Any ideas that you might have would be appreciated.

I hardly think that I should elaborate on the fine "do-it-yourself head-shrinking" course that we've just completed. I enjoyed it not only for its content, but, even more, for the people who made it a lively participating group.

I trust that your trip home was pleasant and uneventful.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. HIESTER
Brigadier General, USA
Commanding

1 Incl
as

Synopsis of An Experimental Officer Efficiency Reporting System

1. General. In late 1962 an experiment in the submission of a new simplified officer efficiency report for all permanently-assigned officers was initiated. It was anticipated that after an experimental period, recommendation might be made to Headquarters, Department of the Army for adoption.
2. Reporting Procedures. Simplicity and mechanization are the keys to this proposal. The report is designed on a standard punched card (see Incl 1). The First-Level Rater is the rated officer's immediate superior, and the Second-Level Rater is the First-Level Rater's immediate superior (formerly the indorser). The card is prepunched and printed with the rated officer's name, service number, birth month and year, report period, and name and service number of both raters. The first- and second-level rating officers merely mark an "X" in the appropriate box and sign the card prior to a suspense date shown on the card. A report is prepared four times a year at three-month intervals beginning during the birth month of the rated officer.
3. Responsibilities of Raters. Separate and independent reports are prepared on each rated officer by the first- and second-level raters. Before selecting the appropriate rating, the rater assumes he has been given Department of the Army authority and responsibility to effect promotions. The rating is based on all available information and observations made of the rated officer as a whole. The report contains a rating box opposite each of five distinct rating categories. The highest of these categories is "Promote this officer immediately," while the lowest is "Eliminate this officer from the service." There is also a rating box between each of these five distinct categories. One should attempt to rate the officer by marking one of five distinct categories. If this fails, one should find the two categories between which the officer fits and rate him on an "in-between" box. If the rater does not know or has not observed the officer, the rating should be "Promote this officer when his time comes based on his seniority." Upon completion of the rating, the card is sent to a data-processing facility for coding. Once the coding is completed, the card serves as a machineable record.
4. Job Descriptions. During the birthday month, each rated officer will describe all principal and major duties performed by him during the past year. These job descriptions will be limited to designation of unit, organization, section or other organizational element in which duty was performed, degree of responsibility, type and number of personnel supervised, amount of equipment or materiel responsible for, inclusive dates for each duty, and any other information which will reflect clearly the type and length of duties performed. The report will be double-spaced and limited to 250 typewritten words on one side of one sheet of paper. The report will be sent to the first-level rater for concurrence and forwarding.
5. Annual Report. Each year the rated officer receives a "5-Year Rating Report." This report will show the name of each of his raters for each period and the adjusted rating obtained for the preceding five years, plus a final 5-year adjusted score.

6. Coding and Rater Adjustment. Actual coding values of the categories will determine the rating values and raters' adjustment factors. For example, the first block might be worth 500 points, the second, 450 points, the third, 400, etc. Over a period of time, a rater's average rating should be 300. To adjust for rater bias, his average is subtracted from 300 to determine the adjustment factor. Thus a rater who averaged 250 has an adjustment factor of plus 50. An average of 325 would produce a factor of minus 25. Periodically, each rater's history is updated to produce a new adjustment factor.

7. What Mechanization Achieves. Upon the completion of the report by the rater, the remaining processing steps are handled by machines at Department of the Army level. The first step in the procedure updates all raters' adjustment factors. Once the rater's new adjustment factor has been calculated, it is applied to the raw score of the rated officer to determine his adjusted score. The average adjusted score to date will always consist of the previous five years of rating statistics. The average adjusted score is then reported to the rated officer annually showing the results of his previous five years of ratings. This gives him feedback for self-evaluation.

8. Summary. This system possesses the following advantages:

- a. Simple, mechanized, and provides a concise determinant for promotability from the base of the reporting structure.
- b. Ratings are frequent.
- c. Job descriptions will serve to qualify officers for future jobs.
- d. Compensation for rater bias by adjustment factors.
- e. Feedback to the rated officer for self-evaluation.

				<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">OFFICER'S EFFICIENCY REPORT</div>	
SERVICE NUMBER	RATED OFFICER	DOB	PERIOD		
				FOR USE BY PERSONNEL OFFICER	
SERVICE NUMBER	FIRST LEVEL RATER	SERVICE NUMBER	SECOND LEVEL RATER		

RATING (PLACE X IN APPROPRIATE BOX)

If I had the full authority and responsibility to do so, I would:

☐ Promote this officer immediately.

☐ Promote this officer ahead of his contemporaries.

☐ Promote this officer when his time comes based on his seniority.

☐ Not promote this officer.

☐ Eliminate this officer from the service.

SIGNATURE OF RATING OFFICER

DATE SIGNED

SUSPENSE

ALSO FORM 91 (OT) REV 1 MAY 63

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79																																									
SN										GC										RATED OFFICER										MO YR										SN										FIRST LEVEL RATER										R										SN										SECOND LEVEL RATER										R										YR										PL									